UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/573,705	03/27/2006	Katsuml Tokumoto	287610US0PCT	7106	
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P. 1940 DUKE STREET			EXAMINER		
			COONEY, JOHN M		
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1796		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			08/21/2009	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com oblonpat@oblon.com jgardner@oblon.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/573,705	TOKUMOTO ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	John Cooney	1796			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	l. lely filed the mailing date of this communication. (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>20 Ar</u>	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro				
Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) 8-15 is/are withdrawn 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examinet 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the objection to the objection is objected.	election requirement. r. epted or b)□ objected to by the E				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 20060327.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	te			

Election/Restrictions

Page 2

Applicant's election of Group I (claims 1-7) in the reply filed on 4-20-09 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

Claims 8-15 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 4-20-09.

Applicants' proper address of the election of species requirements is acknowledged.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zama et al.(5,171,787).

Zama et al. discloses condensation catalyst which may include the elected catalysts of applicants' claims (see column 6 lines 19-31).

Zama et al. differs from applicants' claims in that selection of more than one of the selected catalysts is not required. However, the reference is clear in its disclosure of the catalysts and their function of catalyzing condensation reactions, and it has been held by the court that "it is prima facie obvious to combine two compositions each of which is taught by the prior art to be useful for the same purpose, in order to form a third composition to be used for the very same purpose.... [T]he idea of combining them flows logically from their having been individually taught in the prior art." In re-Kerkhoven, 626 F.2d 846, 850, 205 USPQ 1069, 1072 (CCPA 1980)(M.P.E.P. 2144.06 I.) and the mere duplication of parts has no patentable significance unless a new or unexpected result is produced. (See In re Harza, 274 F.2d 669, 124 USPQ 378 (CCPA 1960), as well as, M.P.E.P. 2144.04 VI. B.). Accordingly, it would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art to have employed multiple catalysts of Zama et al. in the formation of preparations of Zama et al. for the purpose of duplicating their effect in order to arrive at the products of applicants' claims with the expectation of success in the absence of a showing of new or unexpected results.

Claims 4-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zama et al. as applied to claims 1-3 above, and further in view of Decker et al.(5,997,954).

Claims differ in that they do not employ the elected compound (C) of applicants' claims. However, Decker et al. discloses 1,2-dimethylimidazole to be a well known condensation catalyst (column 6 lines 45-53). Accordingly, it would have been obvious

Application/Control Number: 10/573,705

Art Unit: 1796

for one having ordinary skill in the art to have employed the 1,2-dimethylimidazole condensation catalyst of Decker et al. as a condensation catalyst in the preparations of Zama et al. for the purpose of imparting its condensation catalytic effect in order to arrive at the products of applicants' claims with the expectation of success in the absence of a showing of new or unexpected results. Hereto it applies that "it is prima facie obvious to combine two compositions each of which is taught by the prior art to be useful for the same purpose, in order to form a third composition to be used for the very same purpose.... [T]he idea of combining them flows logically from their having been individually taught in the prior art." In re Kerkhoven, 626 F.2d 846, 850, 205 USPQ 1069, 1072 (CCPA 1980)(M.P.E.P. 2144.06 I.) and the mere duplication of parts has no patentable significance unless a new or unexpected result is produced. (See *In re Harza*, 274 F.2d 669, 124 USPQ 378 (CCPA 1960), as well as, M.P.E.P. 2144.04 VI. B.).

Page 4

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Smith et al. (column 10) is cited for its disclosure of relevant catalysts of the instant concern in related preparations. Yoshimura et al. and Farrissey,Jr. et al. are cited for their disclosure of catalysts of the instant concern in isocyanate based foam preparations. Burdeniuc et al. is cited for its relevant preparational disclosures.

Application/Control Number: 10/573,705 Page 5

Art Unit: 1796

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John Cooney whose telephone number is 571-272-1070. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 9 to 6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Seidleck, can be

reached on 571-272-1078. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-

8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval

(PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status

information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see

http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business

Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/John Cooney/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1796